The
MEANING OF IMPERIALISM

By CONRAD NOEL
Vicar of Thaxted

Issued by the League Against Imperialism [British Section]
30 John Street, Bedford Row, London, W.C.1

Price One Penny

Watford Printers Limited, 58 Vicarage Road, Watford

The Meaning of Imperialism.

IMPERIALISTS have recently discovered that the word "empire" has begun to sound ugly in the public ear; so now they call the British Empire the British Commonwealth. Empire and commonwealth are both associations of people, as are whist drives, penitentiaries, socials, and prisons. A commonwealth is a voluntary association of people; an empire is not. A commonwealth is a voluntary union of peoples out of which any given party to the union can contract at will; an empire is a forced union of peoples out of which a people would have to fight its way in the teeth of armies and battleships. Our white dominions might possibly be described as part of a commonwealth; our dependencies could not possibly be so described. The Dominions account for about seventeen million people, while the British Empire more accurately so called subjects to its rule and governance from four hundred to four hundred and fifty million people.

OTHER EMPIRES.

We are not so much concerned in this pamphlet with other empires and their ruthless exploitation of subject peoples, with the empire of France, its financial penetrations and territorial annexations, its seizure of Algeria, Tunis, Somaliland, Madagascar; its hundreds of thousands of square miles in the Congo, West Africa, North Africa and Syria; nor with the imperialism of Belgium; nor with the aggressive expansion of Italy; nor with imperial America's high moral aims and low and cunning achievements which have resulted in her annexation of seven hundred thousand square miles of territory and thirteen millions of people. To all and sundry empires the League against Imperialism is equally opposed, but here in England we are more immediately concerned with the British Empire.

BRITISH APOLOGISTS.

The Pharisee in the parable thanked God he was not as others, extortioners, etc. There is such a thing as collective pharisaism and Mr. Baldwin is its prophet. On Empire Day, 1927, he thanked God we were not as others : "there has never been anything like the British Empire in the world before . . . you sometimes associate our empire with Rome, Germany, Austria, Russia, France (the unkindest cut of all) . . . you must rid yourselves of all these associations"; and his colleague, Mr. Amery, tells us why, for he assures us that "the watchwords of our Empire Day Movement are responsibility, duty, sympathy, self sacrifice," and the imperialist "Round Table" supports him, insisting that our Empire exists not for the purposes of conquest or exploitation or power "but for peace and freedom and the right to work out their salvation to all the people and races within it." The Liberal imperialists agree. Lloyd George (Imperial Conference, 1921,) tells us that the British Empire is based not on force but on goodwill. Liberty is its binding principle.

Have not our national poets taught us to sing "send him victorious, happy and glorious" and "wider still and wider may thy bounds be set," and insisted that it is God who has given us dominion over palm (palm oil!) and pine, and over "lesser breeds without the law." Why then should we not all swell that majestic chorus, "God who made thee mighty, make thee mightier yet."

But we are a little bewildered when we remember that the Roman Empire had also its Baldwins and Amerys, its moral apologists, and that the Kaiser, backed by the German school books, taught his people that they were the servants of the All Highest to spread German kultur to the ends of the earth; and what of France's "mission civilisatrice" to "natives" and the approval of the saintly De Foucauld, always ready with the Blessed Sacrament on the field of slaughter when the French guns, blest by the priests, are blowing the uncivilised sky high?

What of the red rubber atrocities of imperialist Belgium in the Congo and of the fact that she annexed it under the sanction of something like the League of Nations, the patronage of His Most Catholic Majesty Leopold, and the protestant missionary, Stanley, and put forward a prospectus for its exploitation which spoke of the "humane and benevolent purposes" which the promoters had in view in opening up the Congo for commerce and civilisation?

Was it not the imperial duty of America to go to war with Spain to protect the cruelly-treated Cubans? Was it not the call of the God of mercy that she should do so, and an unfortunate accident that for years and years the call of God does not appear to have reached her ears till suddenly she heard it about the same time that she had invested millions in Cuba and had to protect her vested interests?

These moral apologies are as old as the hills, and make us hesitate in accepting the assurances of Messrs. Baldwin and Co. to the effect that the British Empire is not like others are, or even as these French or American extortioners.

EARLY BRITISH ADVENTURES.

Our first adventures in imperialism hardly support the moral interpretation. Take the case of Ireland and our policy there; the "starvation of her industries, the strangling of her trade and the slow murder of her population." Chesterton in his "Crimes of England" sums up our Irish adventure as a veritable massacre of the innocents, Lecky describes it as "a tissue of brutality and hypocrisy" and Gladstone denounced the forcible union of 1800, in honour of which originated the Union Jack, as a policy of "plunder, rape, torture and wholesale murder." The Black and Tan regime, denounced indignantly by so mild a paper as the "Church Times," does not suggest humanitarianism, and while the British Press was always groaning at the cost of administering Ireland, the "Morning Post," in a last desperate appeal not to let Ireland go, blurted out that our reasons for holding her were not

humanitarian, but strategic and economic, for in one shape or another she brought us in an annual tribute of some forty million pounds.

Turn to India and read "The Other Side of the Medal," a very candid and beautifully written document by an imperialist, Edward Thomson, planned to counteract "all the poison and untruth" about India on which our school children are brought up—brutal annexations of huge territories, wholesale exploitation and oppression, and more immediately the theft of the Province of Oudh which was answered by the Indian "Mutiny." There were indefensible horrors on both sides, but it was the greased cartridges folly, *i.e.*, the forcing of people to do acts against their religion, tantamount to forcing Christians to spit upon the cross of Christ, which on top of all this robbery and brutality drove them to rebellion. The British reprisals included the branding of victims with red hot coppers, burning alive over slow fires, compelling Hindus to defile themselves, sewing Mahomedans in pig skins and smearing them with pork fat before murdering them. Macaulay speaks of fortunes wrung from the miseries of the people, of villages deserted before the onward march of the British Empire whose rule was "oppressive as the most oppressive form of Barbarian despotism."

Turn to China and read Justin MacCarthy's "History of our own Times" for an account of the two wars by which we forced opium upon the people and ourselves into the heart of their country. This historian describes our imperialist adventure in China as a tale of burglary, lying and massacre unsurpassed in the records of any imperial nation.

These then were the methods by which in those early adventures in empire building we spread our imperial rule and seized the territories of "lesser breeds without the law," the "breeds" in question being the ancient civilisations of Ireland, India and China.

THE BRITISH EMPIRE AS A SLAVE TRADING COMPANY.

But pamphlets broadcast on Empire Day assure us that wherever the Union Jack flies, there is liberty for all and that the British Empire has the proud distinction of being the first to abolish slavery.

You would hardly gather from this that till almost within living memory the British Empire was the largest slaving association in the world; that the cities of Bristol, Glasgow and Liverpool were built upon the colossal profit of the trade in human flesh; that from the sixteenth to the middle of the nineteenth century not thousands, but millions, of people have been torn from their homes, transported under conditions of unspeakable devilry to other parts of the empire, there to provide cheap labour for the dominant race.

There has been in use in the Council schools a history book teaching children to glory in the British victories which led to the Treaty of Utrecht, and in the terms of that treaty which it describes as a notice to all foreigners to "keep off the grass." It suppresses

the fact that the particular patch of grass off which the Spaniards were in future to keep was the slave trade, which was henceforth to be the monopoly of our glorious empire. Henceforth, writes a British historian, "the slave trade is its protection, and its increase became the predominant concern of British imperial policy." Vigorous protests were indeed raised, but our rulers in Church and State turned, hardened their hearts against all such protests, and in 1775 the Secretary of State for the Colonies declared that we could not allow colonists to "check or discourage in any degree a traffic so beneficial to the nation."

Within ten years nearly a thousand ships were engaged at the port of Liverpool in this "beneficial traffic," trading in over three hundred thousand slaves to the value of fifteen million pounds. Sometimes the British were prevented by climate from penetrating into African interiors, but British pluck and enterprise prevails over all difficulties and devised a new way of spreading the blessings of peace and goodwill by setting tribe against tribe, so that by means of civil war thousands of victims should fall into their nets. Meanwhile public opinion in England was being stirred up by "unpatriotic" sentimentalists against this particular form of imperialism and the result of the agitation was according to the Empire Day propagandists that the British Empire was "the first to abolish slavery." But the facts are again against them.

1789. Grégoire, a Catholic bishop, as result of vigorous propaganda in the French Assembly, with the support of Christians and anti-Christians, prevails upon the Revolution to abolish slavery in the French colonies, whilst in England the strenuous campaign of Wilberforce is still unsuccessful and an Abolition Bill is thrown out.

1792. Denmark abolishes slavery.

1794. America, eighty years after she has wrenched her way out of the British Empire, abolishes slavery in her northern States, and the year after another Abolition Bill is defeated in the British Parliament.

1807. Bill reintroduced and carried, but British slavery trade still flourishes.

1811. British subjects forbidden to trade in slaves, but prohibition disregarded.

1812. Sweden abolishes the trade.

1813. Holland follows suit.

1833. Britain abolishes the traffic and in the next year makes the abolition effectual by voting twenty millions in compensation to owners. None of these countries seems to have given any compensation to slaves by which they might have been assured a start in some approach to economic freedom and avoided the meshes of slavery of another kind. Great Britain was therefore not the first but the sixth to abolish chattel slavery, and even then cannot be said to have abolished it altogether.

After 1833 there have been a good many spots within the British Empire where chattel slavery has been winked at, and often openly

practised; even to-day it flourishes in its most revolting form under the Union Jack in the British colony of Hong Kong. There Chinese children are sold into "domestic" slavery, are paid no wages and often cruelly treated. Many of them are sold into prostitution, which so well suits the convenience of a certain type of resident Britisher that the British Empire tells us this year of grace, 1929, that it can do nothing and intends to do nothing for these ten thousand child victims, although it promised to abolish the system years ago.

BUT WAS SLAVERY ACTUALLY ABOLISHED?

While all this agitation was going forward to abolish slavery in distant lands, what of the land of England itself, the heart of the Empire? A British historian devotes a chapter of his book to "English Slavery" and tells us of pauper children "doomed to slavery," paid no wages, worked sixteen hours a day, starved and flogged, "nominally apprentices . . . in reality mere slaves." Women in mines and factories were not much better treated, while men worked incredible hours for wages sometimes as low as six shillings a week, and were imprisoned or exiled if they attempted to combine to remedy their grievances.

A small group among the governing classes, together with the workers themselves, have succeeded in remedying some of the most glaring abuses, but a by no means alarmist churchman, Archdeacon Peile, in his Bampton Lectures for 1907 can still describe the condition of the workers as follows : "We say there is no slavery, or not very much, under the British flag, but what, if we look at it sincerely, are the conditions of casual and underpaid labour but slavery without its safeguards?" British workers "cannot leave their miserable work, or if they do wander away, it is only to find conditions elsewhere equally cruel and degrading."

Turn to the Fifth Report of the Archbishops on Economic Conditions and you will find that much the same conclusion is reached.

OUR SLAVE DEPENDENCIES.

If then this is true of the heart of the Empire, how much worse will be the conditions of the coloured people whom we own and exploit?

The Anti-slavery and Aborigines Protection Society, a very moderate body which could hardly be accused of "Bolshevik" exaggerations, says that the people of Southern Rhodesia placed their faith in the British people and in consequence their land "has been appropriated simply by fraud and theft—that is the beginning and end of the whole sordid story." We went to war "with the intention of robbing the natives of their land," dispossessing eight hundred thousand people, and forcing them to work for Britishers by compelling them to earn the cash to pay the necessary taxes we imposed. St. Loe Strachey, one time editor of the "Spectator," a strenuous defender of the capitalist system, is nevertheless dismayed at the British Empire and asserts that "slavery has found in forced labour a most convenient disguise." He speaks of labour

agreements with the chiefs which "are really contractual slavery." Lord Buxton and Lord Olivier have written to the same effect and describe the expropriation of the people not in Rhodesia, but in other parts of Africa, the depriving of the natives of their ancient rights in the land in order that they may be compelled to work for Europeans.

We boast that we have put down inter-tribal wars. True enough, but we compelled Africans to fight in the 1914 war, and it is reckoned that more Africans lost their lives in that adventure than in all the tribal wars of the last half century before our rule.

Father Cripps, now an Essex vicar, but with twenty years' intimate experience of Rhodesia behind him, in his "Africa for the Africans," brings the story down to 1927. The area of S. Rhodesia is ninety-six million acres, of which the whites hold thirty-one million, and the eight hundred thousand original owners have to be content with twenty-one million acres, and of the remaining millions of acres it is now proposed to apportion by far the biggest share to the whites. Father Cripps deals sternly with the facts about forced labour, and shows an alarming death rate among its victims; in one contingent ninety-four per cent. died, a percentage which left the imperialist gang in the British Parliament unmoved, when it was debated, as they pointed out that the death rate was often as pleasantly low as fifty, or even forty, per cent! The Anglican Fathers of Mirfield comment angrily in their mission magazine on these facts, but add it is almost hopeless to expect a sense of justice among the British people as "most Europeans never seem to acknowledge that christian teaching should be applied in these matters or that brotherhood has any meaning as applied to natives."

SLAVERY IN EAST AFRICA.

Turn to Kenya and things will be found to be just as bad or worse. Forty years ago the whole land belonged to its people. The British Empire has robbed them of thousands of acres, and crowded them on to less fertile land, and this they hold merely at the whim of the imperial administration. There is the usual tale of forced labour at almost starvation wages. The evidence may be found in Dr. Norman Leys' books and articles, and the doctor was no mere casual inquirer, but has spent the best part of his life in the Government service. His facts are now attested by McGregor Ross, at one time High Commissioner of Works in Kenya and with twenty years' Government experience of the colony. His "Kenya from Within" gives other facts which have even staggered Norman Leys.

Frank Weston, late Bishop of Zanzibar, whose diocese includes what was German East Africa and is now Tanganyika, once a British imperialist who had to protest against German brutality, was later compelled in sheer disgust to write a pamphlet called "The Black Serfs of Great Britain," an impassioned attack on the British Empire, its ferocity, its exploitation, its slave methods and its broken pledges to the natives. He appeals in this pamphlet to the British people "to save the Africans from this new form of slavery." The

story is brought up to date by Archdeacon Owen, of Kenya, who carries on the fight. His letters in the "Manchester Guardian" in 1928 expose the slave conditions which still obtain. The forced labour laws are bad enough, but they are again and again exceeded. Gangs of men are compelled to leave their ordinary work at sixpence a day to work on Government employment at twopence halfpenny a day, and he gives instances of men who have applied for wages and instead of wages have got a flogging with a hippo-hide whip from the ganger. Girls of ten to sixteen years of age are forced to carry heavy loads of material for thatching, and sometimes have to do a journey which, with the return march, amounts to thirty miles a day. Some of these children did journeys amounting to ninety miles and received, after months of agitation and delay, threepence halfpenny each.

OUR MODEL COLONIES.

Some empire apologists say that although these statements may be true of Rhodesia, Kenya, China, India, etc., they are untrue of the Sudan and Nigeria. If economic greed be the motive in other parts of our empire, at least in these dependencies the humanitarian motive reigns supreme. Was our penetration of the Sudan and of Nigeria motived by greed or by those moral ideals of which Messrs. Baldwin, Amery, and Lloyd George are the guardians?

Was our Egyptian adventure based "not on force but on goodwill," and has "liberty" been the guiding principle of our continued occupation?

First there entered the British and foreign usurers encouraging the Khedive in extravagant schemes for which the peasant had to pay. Even "The Times" (June 27, 1877) speaking of taxes paid by the peasants in kind, observed : "when one thinks of the poverty stricken, overdriven, underfed fellaheen, in their miserable hovels, working late and early to fill the pockets of the creditor, the punctual payment of the coupon ceases to be wholly a subject of gratification." The rebellion of the people thus burdened was answered by our bombardment of Alexandria and by the forcible occupation of Egypt. We gave repeated promises of early withdrawal, which have not yet been fulfilled. Joseph Chamberlain was under no illusions, "our empire is commerce, it was created by commerce; it was founded on commerce, and it could not exist a day without commerce"; for this reason we must never release our grip on India or Africa; "for the same reason I approve of the continued occupation of Egypt."

The humanitarian spirit of our rule is well illustrated by what has been called the Denshawai infamy. English officers shot the pigeons belonging to the villagers. A scuffle ensued, and these British gentlemen shot several villagers and wounded a woman whose husband with some others set on the officers and beat them. They killed no one, but it transpired at the trial that a British officer running for help fell down dead, killed by sunstroke. A court violating every law of the land was set up, and its bloody

sentences, from which there was no appeal, were speedily executed. Practically the whole male population of the village was arrested, and tried. Four were hanged, the husband of the woman was sentenced to penal servitude for life. A number of other sentences were imposed and floggings administered between the hangings. All these things were done with the knowledge and approval of Lord Cromer. At home these infamies met with protest, but the Liberal Lord Grey supported them.

As to the Sudan, we do not wish to whitewash the imperial Egyptian administration there, but when it is suggested that we, Great Britain, supplanted Egypt for humanitarian motives, we emphatically deny it. Great Britain occupies the Sudan for purposes of production, trade, profit and usury.

That our rule there is less oppressive than our rule in Kenya is readily admitted, largely owing to the wisdom of Wingate, who succeeded Kitchener and held office as governor for seventeen years. He did much to increase the prosperity of the country and to blot out the memory of the Kitchener regime. That regime would be difficult to parallel from Prussian annals. The none too sensitive Winston Churchill records in his "River War" Kitchener's desecration of the Mahdi's tomb, "the most sacred and holy thing that the people of the Sudan knew." Kitchener orders the tomb to be profaned and razed to the ground, the corpse of the prophet to be dug up, the head separated from the body, the trunk flung into the Nile. "Such," he adds, "was the chivalry of the conquerors." (This passage is erased from the later and cheaper editions).

Whether the people of the Sudan are really happier or not under British rule, the super profits wrung from their labour are enormous. Not many years ago Asquith, supposed to be the soul of honour (parliamentary honour), moved in the British parliament that three and a half million pounds be given to advance the interests of the Sudan Syndicate in which his own family were closely interested, and which sometimes makes a profit of thirty-five per cent. per annum.

If we consider the huge sums invested in Egypt and the Sudan by British usurers and bondholders, we are inclined to be sceptical about our holding of these areas purely for the "uplifting" of their peoples, and it is probable that our scepticism would be shared by Messrs. S. Pearson and Sons, The Callenders Cable Co., Dorman Long, The English Electric Co., the Prudential Assurance, The Kassala Railway Co., the Sudan Construction and Equipment Co., etc., etc.

Study the conditions of land tenure under which we graciously allow the peasant cultivators to hold the land they originally owned, or the worse plight of the shilling a day labourers, and you will begin to perceive the methods of what the gospel calls "extortion and excess" which are operative in this model colony.

NIGERIA AS THE LAND OF PARADISE.

Our early adventures in Nigeria will always be remembered with shame. The traffic in slaves was still rampant long after its "aboli-

tion" and did not in fact cease until the American prohibition of 1861, and the consequent drying up of the market for British-owned flesh and blood. If the population of Nigeria has of late years largely increased under British rule, it must be remembered that under that same rule it was so largely diminished that whole districts became practically desolate.

Our hold on Nigeria was secured in the approved manner, first by commercial companies with the Empire behind them inducing the chiefs to barter away the rights of their people, or inflaming tribe against tribe. Later a British Protectorate was declared, cruel customs were suppressed, internecine wars stopped, security established and profits thereby multiplied.

Lugard, when he was governor, favoured a policy of peasant proprietorship, believing that more profit could be extracted from the workers if they owned their individual plots of land, but Sir Percy Girouard, who followed him, was keen on tribal custom and believed in a more communal system, but under the British Empire as ultimate Lord of the soil. He was a man of genuine sympathy and much understanding, but the tribal communism which he advocated from disinterested motives is used by certain commercial imperialists to advance their gains, for as the former editor of the "Spectator" points out, this system buttresses up the power of native chieftains who supply "parcels" of natives to the exploiters; the chieftain having the right to demand so much labour from his tribe. "The money is paid to the chieftain and no questions are asked provided the black goods are punctually delivered."

Forced labour is employed in our model colonies, the Sudan and Nigeria, to build roads and construct railways at an average wage of about six shillings a week, while usurers in Great Britain reap colossal profits on the loans with which the work is carried out. In the tin mines the average wage is six shillings a week, and one of the mining companies is paying dividends of sometimes fifty, sometimes eighty per cent. per annum.

Taking all the tin mines together, Elinor Burns (West Africa, Colonial Series, L.R.D.) reckons that in an eight hours day the people work two hours for themselves and six for the capitalists. Much the same may be said of the coal mining at Enugu, where the conditions are disgraceful and much complaint is made of the brutalities of foremen.

Then there are the thousands of wretchedly paid porters and carriers of our model colony to be considered.

Ask the bankers of Nigeria if we hold on to that country merely for the uplift of the natives. Ask Armstrong & Co., Arrol & Co., Lever Bros., or the shipping interests, Elder Dempster & Co., who carry the heavy constructional material and run the passenger traffic, or ask the men who sweat out a miserable existence in the holds of their ships.

Consider the Collective Punishment Ordinance passed to guard against risk of these miserable slaves rising in rebellion against

our administration. This measure imposes fines or imprisonment upon tribes or communities whose conduct has been such as to require the employment of police or soldiers for the enforcing of order, or the collecting of taxes. If the fine imposed is not paid by the community within three weeks, the property of all or of any of the persons defaulting may be seized.

The motive of our rule in West Africa is not humanitarian as is admitted by the imperialist, Sir Harry Johnstone, who writes: "since we have begun to control the political affairs of parts of West Africa and the Niger Basin, our annual trade with those countries, rendered secure, has risen from a *few hundred thousand pounds a year to about ten millions.* This is sufficient justification for our continued government of these regions and their occasional cost to us in men and money." Dr. Parker Moon shows that even by 1924 the figure has risen by some twenty-five million per annum, and believes that this prodigious rise is due to the somewhat freer methods of land holding, etc., which allow the Britisher to exploit the native the more effectually.

We are however informed that the communal system is threatened and that the administration is considering the adoption of plantation methods.

It seems, therefore, that both in our "model" dependencies as in all the rest the motive of our rule has been something other than peace and justice, goodwill and liberty.

What then is the main motive of imperial annexations and the continued empire grip on its dependencies?

A BONDHOLDERS' EMPIRE.

Frank Weston, Bishop of Zanzibar, became convinced that "the Government of Great Britain regards East Africa as a commercial asset to be developed in the interest of a small number of settlers and exploited for the relief of the British taxpayer."

Unfortunately for Mr. Baldwin his own Home Secretary has let him down, and on March 2, 1926, blurted out the truth in a parliamentary debate. This is what he said: "We did not conquer India for the benefit of the Indians . . . that is cant." And again, "we conquered India as an outlet for the goods of Great Britain. We conquered India by the sword and by the sword we shall hold it." Someone cried, "shame"; "call shame if you like, I am stating facts . . . I am interested in missionary work in India and have done much work of that kind, but I am not such a hypocrite as to say that we hold India for the Indians . . . we hold it as the finest outlet for British goods in general and for Lancashire cotton goods in particular."

With Sir William Joynson Hicks agrees Baden Powell, of boy scout fame. The Boy Scout movement is, he assures us, international and peace loving. This is what he teaches his boys and urges that all scoutmasters should teach them: "We had to fight the hordes of natives, and gradually foot by foot by dint of hard fighting we have won that country (India) for our Empire." And

now the empire is a "paying concern" and in all our dependencies "we are spreading the blessings of peace and justice, and doing away with slavery and oppression, and developing commerce and manufactures." And how are we developing them? at what cost and what are the usurers' gains? The direct drain wrung from the Indian people is colossal, the indirect drain far surpasses it. The total British capital invested in India in 1919 was over a million, in 1920 over three million, in 1922 over thirty-six million. We now take from India a yearly indirect tribute of seventy to eighty million pounds. (Palme Dutt. "Modern India.") And against this enormous tribute we must put the mass of half-starved peasants, many thousands of women workers in coal and salt mines underground in semi-slave conditions, earning about three and six a week, while the men earn not much above seven shillings weekly. 200,000 miners on the verge of starvation, miners doing heavy work at sevenpence a day, Bombay cotton mills with dividends of sometimes forty, sometimes one hundred and twenty pounds per cent. per annum, wrung from men earning ten to twelve shillings a week, and women earning much less, the workers many of them, housed in pitch dark dwellings traversed by open drains. Then there are the Calcutta Jute mills sometimes able to pay a hundred per cent. per annum with wages averaging about half-a-crown a week. We are told that seventy-four out of seventy-five of the mills are owned by British capitalists who boast of their patriotism and yet are destroying the workers at home by this transplantation of their mills to India where labour can be had for next to nothing, which will drive down the British workers to increasing slavery and starvation. You cannot be a patriot and a capitalist imperialist. You must either love Scotland and hate the empire which is ruining it, or fight imperialism for the love of England or Scotland, and put an end to the Empire which is ruining the home people body and soul. One of the Empire Day pamphlets forgets its hypocritical pretence of patriotism and explains "without her empire, Britain is nothing."

Why do we not let the Indian people go? Let mammon answer. We hold India in bondage for the one hundred and ten million pounds we draw from her wretchedness annually by means of the direct and indirect drain.

Turn to China, where another colleague of Mr. Baldwin, Sir Austen Chamberlain, admits that humanitarian motives are not our object. Again and again he assures us that all we want is trade, and in a more candid moment he added that we had invested there something like two hundred and fifty million pounds. ("Daily News," Jan. 31, 1927) and, urging the sending of more troops, more battleships, General Sutton said, "unless we act at once we can write off all British investments in China" ("Daily Express," Dec. 14, 1927). Labour conditions in China, in British owned factories, at Shanghai, Hankow, Tientsin, etc., etc., are disgraceful and women, practically slaves, may be seen in British owned Hong Kong as elsewhere pulling heavy cargo junks and bowed

down under loads of building material. British and other European capitalists in China oppose every attempt on the part of the workers to combine, flogging and shooting strike leaders. Amery says our empire is based on sympathy and sacrifice, and we begin to see who they are who form the sacrifice and to what God the sacrificial offering is made.

The late Bishop of Chichester drives home the corporate guilt of Great Britain. On March 16, 1926, he spoke as follows: "A great measure of literal bloodguiltiness is on the Church and the Nation for the slave traffic and the multitudes who were killed by it, for the wars of conquest and greed in India and China, for the exploitation of the natives, for the theft of their land and the sweating of their labour."

The great empire builders, Cecil Rhodes and Joseph Chamberlain, both Birmingham men, both hailing from the heavy industries district, did not indulge in the more recent humanitarian cant. The former took pride in empire as "an affair of the belly," the latter boasted that "our parliament's most important duty is the development and maintenance of the vast (overseas) agricultural, industrial, and commercial enterprises . . . all the great offices of State are occupied with commercial affairs . . . The Foreign Office and Colonial Office are chiefly engaged in finding new markets and defending old ones. The War Office and the Admiralty are mostly engaged in preparation for the defence of these markets and for the protection of commerce . . . even the Education Department bases its claim to the public money upon the necessity of keeping our people well to the front in the commercial competition which they have to sustain . . . Commerce is the greatest of all public interests." (Quoted, Woolf, "Empire and Commerce," p.7).

SUMMARY OF THE STAGES OF MODERN IMPERIALISM.

We described Empire (distinct from Commonwealth) as a compulsory union of peoples out of which no subject race can contract at will. That was a preliminary definition. For a fuller definition we may adopt the manifesto of the Chinese Kuomintang, before it was captured by European interests. Its members asserted that they were opposed to all forms of imperialism and had for their own country no imperialist aim. They went on to describe modern imperialism as "the utilization by any people of its political and military ascendency for subjecting to its economic encroachment some foreign country or territory or race." We are now in a position to analyse more in detail the various stages of modern imperialism and especially imperialism of the British variety.

First Stage. Emigration or colonizing imperialism, creating eventually what are now known as the British Dominions, practically free of Britain, having grown so strong that they could contract out at will, so might be called parts of a white Commonwealth, but in their inception were parts of the Empire, that inception accompanied by ruthless cruelty in many instances and the des-

truction of the original inhabitants. Now the Dominions are themselves becoming empires, exploiting subject races.

Second Stage. Commercial Imperialism. Britain extends her rule and dominion by trickery, war, annexations, in order the more effectually to exploit by commerce, ring-fencing territories so acquired to secure for her home manufacturers a monopoly of raw materials, cotton, hides, vegetable oils, rubber, etc., to be worked up into finished goods, artificially developing the appetites of the peoples of the dependencies and their economic demands for finished British goods, and so far as may be, excluding rival imperialisms from supplying those protected and fenced markets. British capitalists producing surplus goods were driven to this imperialist expansion owing to the drying up of their former European markets in Germany, France, and elsewhere, which now manufacture and supply those markets which formerly had bought of England.

Third Stage. Industrial or Metal Imperialism, marked by the export of heavy goods, iron and steel, alongside of the export of finished goods, fabrics, etc. This export of heavy goods for the construction of roads, harbours, railways, forts, and later factories, increases in volume and importance. In short we find that State Imperial action more and more directly pursues an aggressive imperialist policy and protects the distant finance operations of its industrialists and traders.

Meanwhile monopoly is replacing competition, the latter being found to further more effectively that economic greed which was the motive of the earlier competitive method.

Huge trusts and combines begin to emerge, and the banks are beginning to abandon their former role of mere usurers and money lenders to industrial enterprise at fixed percentages and themselves to enter industry and so control it, participating both in management and profits.

Fourth Stage. Finance Imperialism. The banks now merged into a few banking trusts in each empire have more and more acquired the industries of their respective countries, the industries themselves being further merged into a few trusts and combines. Finance and industrial capital are now interlaced, banks having the controlling shares in this or that combine, and directors with seats on the boards of the companies dictating policies of daughter and subsidiary concerns, all this further interlaced with control of Parliaments and the Press. Along with this goes a more voracious grip on far dependencies, increasing export of heavy metal goods, and more important than this an actual export of fluid capital, money, in loans and investments. In this period foreign factories in our Eastern dependencies, largely British owned or British controlled are developing and producing finished goods with sweated coloured labour which forces down the wages of the home producer or throws him altogether on to the scrap heap, as permanently unemployed.

The Financial groups which control the various nations as well as dictating their imperial policy and the policy of their country's dependencies more and more by usurious loaning penetrate European countries and with increasing financial dictation there goes increasing political dictation of the affairs of weaker countries, arousing the hostility of other imperial groups and threatening European conflagration.

We have laid bare the main reason for imperial expansion in the last phase of capitalism. It now remains to give the total extorted annually by the British Bondholding Empire from its dependencies.

THE BRITISH EMPIRE SUBJECTING A QUARTER OF THE WORLD'S AREA AND A QUARTER OF THE WORLD'S POPULATION TO ITS DOMINION, EXTORTS AN ANNUAL SUM OF ABOUT TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY MILLION POUNDS FROM ITS VICTIMS.

It is suggested that if this corporate usury is to continue, we may yet see Great Britain converted into a kind of riviera for the plutocrats, such English workers as are lucky enough to find any work at all being engaged in parasitic employments, tending the rich masters as "slaves of the palace." England a vast park or pleasure ground for the amusement of those few who live by extortion of the workers in the dependencies.

C. F. Andrews, an anglican priest who was sometime vice president of a theological college at Cambridge and later of the All-India T.U.C., and who has for years identified himself with the Indian and African peoples in their struggle for liberty, writes as follows in his "Christ and Labour," published by the Christian Student Movement. "It is necessary to come nearer home and to consider the question of British Imperialism as a world power in relation to labour. Here above all an Englishman needs to be on his guard against the cant of self congratulation and self praise: for it is not difficult for us to take the flattering unction to our souls that we are philanthropists and world reformers, while in reality money is the main object we are seeking. Quoting Professor Panniker with approval and making his words his own he concludes, "there is a group of imperialists which considers the imperialism as the union of nationalities for a common defence of liberty . . . unfortunately this reading of history is profoundly untrue. Great Britain, whatever may be its policy with regard to its daughter communities, certainly does not stand for freedom and national life for the great majority of non-European people. What it stands for is a white oligarchy exploiting coloured nations. It is in fact a British Empire Company Limited, which like all other trade interests is concerned only in giving a maximum profit to its shareholders."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

For a general study of modern imperialism throughout the world, by far the best of the expensive books is Parker Moon's **"Imperialism and World Politics"** (Macmillan, 1926): should if possible be bought not borrowed: a storehouse of facts; suggested remedies inconclusive. Lenin's **"Imperialism; The Last Stage of Capitalism"** (Communist Party, 1916) best of cheaper books; brings out clearly the economic motive. Pavlovitch's **"The Foundations of Imperialist Policy"** (Labour Publishing Company, 1918-19 contains much of Lenin's information; more detailed on iron and steel phases, and a searching criticism of the reformist Marxian, Kautsky. Lenin's book embodies invaluable quotations from Hobson's **"Imperialism,"** which is out of print. **"An Outline of Modern Imperialism"** (Plebs League, 2/6) good account of modern empires and their growth. Students should buy Horrabin's **"Plebs Atlas of Imperialism"** 1/-, maps excellent. Pamphlets, **"Imperialism,"** Emile Burns (Labour Research Department, 1927, sixpence), **"Modern Capitalism,"** Maurice Dobb (L.R.D., sixpence) both these invaluable. One or other of the various economic atlasses should be purchased.

BRITISH IMPERIALISM. Horrabin's **"Short History of the British Empire"** (Plebs, 1/-) excellent; also pamphlet, **"The Crime of Empire"** (C. A. Smith, I.L.P. twopence) attack from Christian Standpoint, but pacifist. C. F. Andrew's **"Christ and Labour"** (Student Christian Movement) powerful. For defence a symposium called **"The Empire and the Future"** Newton, Steel-Maitland, Michael E. Sadler, H. A. L. Fisher, etc.

AFRICA etc. Leonard Woolf, **"Economic Imperialism"** (Swarthmore Press, 2/6) useful and much better than his later **"Imperialism and Civilization."** Norman Leys, various, Weston, Bishop of Zanzibar **"The Black Serfs of Great Britain,"** (out of print, but quoted in the recent **"Life"**) Father Cripps' **"Africa for the Africans."** Morel's **"Black Man's Burden."** McGregor Ross, **"Kenya From Within."**

CHINA. Wong Chung-Wei's **"China and the Powers"** (Hopkins, 1927, 7/6).

EGYPT. George Young's **"Egypt."**

INDIA. Palme Dutt's **"Modern India"** (Communist Party, 2/6) the best survey of economic motive. Lajpat Rai's **"England's Debt to India"**: useful for the direct economic "drain." Thompson's **"The other Side of the Medal"** (Hogarth Press, 1925) invaluable for history of our methods of acquisition, from an honest minded imperialist historian.

IRELAND. G. K. Chesterton's **"The Crimes of England."** Mrs. J. R. Green's **"Irish Nationality."** (Home Un. Library) Darrell Figgis's **"The Economic Case for Irish Independence."** Chart's **"Economic History of Ireland."** For West Africa, East Africa, China, Egypt, etc., consult **The Sixpenny Colonial Series.** (Labour Research Department.)